

Organization **IC 3600** Bldg./Room **KNOX**
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

U.S. OFFICIAL MAIL
PENALTY FOR
PRIVATE USE \$300
02 1A
0004205065 AUG 24 2005
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314
UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PITNEY BOWES
\$ 00.830

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

146142773 1704 20 08/29/05
FLEISCHMANN & MUGEL LLP
FORWARD TIME EXP RTN TO SEND
JAECKLE FLEISCHMANN & MUGEL LLP
190 LINDEN OAKS
ROCHESTER NY 14625-2812
RETURN TO SENDER

RECEIVED
SEP 01 2005
USPTO MAIL CENTER



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/807,076

03/23/2004

Michael R. Wagner

91420.124103

2650

.7590

08/24/2005

Frank V. Gallucci, Esq.
JAECKLE FLEISCHMANN & MUGEL, LLP
Suite 200
39 State Street
Rochester, NY 14614-1310

EXAMINER

COLLADO, CYNTHIA FRANCISCA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3618

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
OIPE/IAP

SEP 07 2005

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/807,076	Applicant(s) WAGNER, MICHAEL R.	
	Examiner Cynthia F. Collado	Art Unit 3618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 6 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4 and 9-19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/25/2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

4

8

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112 2nd paragraph due to the following:

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said central wall" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said walls" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Note: Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 3618

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (Us Patent No.6, 523,641) in view of K.V.Ray (Us Patent No.3, 282,375).

K.V.Ray discloses a first and second wheel bracket assembly, including a bracket (see figure 6, element 32), an axle segment (see figure 6, element 30), a wheel (see figure 6, element 29). The K.V.Ray reference lacks the teaching of a tow bar assembly. Smith discloses a tow bar (see figure 1, element 20a). Based on the teaching of K.V.Ray, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the game cart of K.V.Ray to include a tow bar assembly to permit hauling by an ATV or automobile.

Regarding claim 1, note that Webster's collegiate Dictionary, 10th Edition defines "kit" as "a set of materials or parts from which something can be assembled".

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 2,4 and 9-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. Claims 3 and 5-8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 6, 523,641 issued to Smith teaches Trailer mounted retractable elevated hunting stand.


Us Patent No.3,282,375 issued to K.V.Ray teaches mobile stand for hunters convertible to a hand cart.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cynthia F. Collado whose telephone number is (571)2728315. The examiner can normally be reached on mon-fri 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Ellis can be reached on (571)2726914. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3618


CFC

 7-29-5
BRYAN FISCHMANN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION

(Use several sheets if necessary)

Docket Number (Optional)

91420.124103

Application Number

10/807,076

Applicant(s)

Wagner

Filing Date

March 23, 2004

Group Art Unit

3611

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL	REF	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
<i>CS</i>	1	4,321,982	03/30/1982	Strickland			
<i>CS</i>	2	5,282,520	02/01/1994	Walker			
<i>CS</i>	3	5,433,291	07/18/1995	Shoestock, Sr.			
<i>CS</i>	4	5,839,538	11/24/1998	Magyar			
<i>CS</i>	5	5,887,676	03/30/1999	Harbin			
<i>CS</i>	6	6,516,919	02/11/2003	Sempel			
<i>CS</i>	7	6,561,529	05/13/2003	Darling, III			
<i>CS</i>	8	6,592,134	07/15/2003	Abraham			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

REF	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	Translation	
						YES	NO

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

EXAMINER

C. Coels

DATE CONSIDERED

7/18/05

EXAMINER: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP Section 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 10/807,076	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination WAGNER, MICHAEL R.	
	Examiner Cynthia F. Collado	Art Unit 3618	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,523,641	02-2003	Smith, Richard D.	182/63.1
	B	US-3,282,375	11-1966	RAY KENNETH V	182/16
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.